



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,331	07/18/2003	Chang-Ming Yang	3073/69	2525
22429	7590	05/04/2007	EXAMINER	
LOWE HAUPTMAN BERNER, LLP			KOHARSKI, CHRISTOPHER	
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 300			3763	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

6D

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/621,331	YANG, CHANG-MING
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher D. Koharski	3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 7/18/2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 4-58 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species and group (Species A and Group I selected), there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 2/08/2007.

Information Disclosure Statement

Examiner acknowledges that no information disclosure statement (IDS) was filed with this application, accordingly, the examiner is not considering any information disclosure statements filed at this time.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because amended drawing Figure 3 filed 10/28/2003 contains minor grammatical errors. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each

drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the multiple protective covers (claim 2) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains references to disclosure Figures 1 and 2. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-2 are objected to because of the following informalities: Regarding claims 1-2, the claims contain numerous grammatical errors, additionally, Examiner request Applicant's representative also correct any withdrawn claims subject to rejoinder for errors. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "said guide tube" in claim 1 paragraph 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. (5,015,237) in view of Gagnieux et al. (6,679,864) in further view of Barrett (4,243,035). Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. discloses a pneumatic powered animal injector.

Regarding claims 1-3, Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. discloses a syringe (Figure 1) which uses air lines (12) and an air tank (10) powered by a compressor, a syringe tube (27) having an injection needle (42) inserted at the tip (35) with a plunger (40) in close contact with a cavity (33) with a plurality of air feed pipes (12, 16) for actuation of the plunger (col 1, lines 60-70; col 2, lines 1-10) (Figures 1-6).

Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. meets the claim limitations as described above except for the protective cover and sterilizer.

However, Gagnieux et al. teaches a safety shield system for prefilled syringes.

Regarding claims 1-3, Gagnieux et al. teaches a slideable syringe protector cover (56) with a hole (37) and a needle (18) attached to syringe barrel (12) with an annular flange (58) and check fitting (59) that moves between a guide tube and syringe barrel (Figures 4-7).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to add the protective cover of Gagnieux et al. to the device of Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. in order to prevent a possible needle stick and needle contamination. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Gagnieux et al. (cols 1-2).

The modified Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. meets the claim limitations as described above except for the sterilizer.

However, Barrett teaches a syringe with integral swab.

Regarding claims 1-3, Barrett teaches a syringe (50) with a pallet (62) and sterilized swab (60) to be fitted on the front end (68) of the syringe for needle (52) (Figure 4-4b).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to add the sterilizer cap of Barrett to the modified system of Kleinwolterink, Jr. et al. in order to keep the needle sterile and prevent contamination. The references are analogous in the art and with the instant invention; therefore, a combination is proper. Therefore, one skilled in the art

would have combined the teachings in the references in light of the disclosure of Barrett (cols 1-2).

Suggested Allowable Subject Matter

The following claim subject matter is suggested by the examiner and considered to distinguish patentably over the art of record in this application and is therefore presented to Applicant for consideration:

Examiner suggests the addition of actuation of the protective cover (2) member via the air feed line (Figure 2) to independent claim 1 to overcome the prior art of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher D. Koharski whose telephone number is 571-272-7230. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am to 4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nick Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Date: 4/21/01

CDK
Christopher D. Koharski
AU 3763

Nicholas D. Lucchesi
NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700